



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS DEALING WITH THE BIBLE

The Temple Dictionary of the Bible. Written and edited by Rev. W. EWING, M.A., and Rev. J. E. H. THOMPSON, D.D. London: J. M. DENT SONS, LTD. (New York: E. P. DUTTON Co.), 1910. pp. lix + 1012.

THE volume which is neatly printed and profusely illustrated will meet the wants of those classes for whom it is intended: "the working clergyman, the local preacher, the class leader, the Sunday School teacher, and the ordinary reader of the Bible." It is popular in style and compact in its contents. The articles present useful summaries; the purely technical is as much as possible eliminated. The bibliographical references are serviceable, though not copious; where a popular treatment of a subject is available it is naturally given precedence; nevertheless, the references are up-to-date. The Dictionary is divided into a Canonical and an Apocryphal section; the former is preceded by special articles dealing with the English Bible, and its influence on English literature; the Apocrypha of the New Testament; Apocalyptic Literature; the Targums; the Versions of the Scriptures; Philo Judæus; Josephus Flavius; the language of Palestine during the time of Jesus; an introductory article on the Apocrypha of the Old Testament precedes the latter section. Eight maps are appended to the volume. The attitude of the editors and contributors (among whom we notice Dalman, Mrs. Gibson, D. S. Margoliouth, Orr, Robertson, Sayce) to the "higher criticism" is a conservative and cautious one; while acknowledging the fulness of information which criticism has laid bare, they shrink back from following its conclusions of the more advanced

type and express a mild doubt as to the cogency of the argument from internal evidence. On the other hand, the Dictionary embodies the latest results of research along the lines of history, geography, and archæology. The editors are certainly in the right when they assert that "there is a place for a Dictionary of the Bible which, leaving aside all that is merely theoretical and speculative, shall present simply and clearly the state of ascertained knowledge on the subjects dealt with, at a price [\$4] which shall bring the latest results of scholarly investigation within the reach of every earnest student of the Bible."

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D. New edition, revised (1910) and printed from new plates. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1910. pp. xxv + xi + 577.

Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Von Dr. E. SELLIN. Leipzig: QUELLE & MEYER, 1910. pp. xv + 153.

Old Testament History and Literature. By B. H. ALFORD, London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., 1910. pp. xix + 318.

The Story of the Bible from the standpoint of modern scholarship. By WALTER L. SHELDON. Second edition. Philadelphia: S. BURNS WESTON, 1909. pp. 187.

The last edition of Prof. Driver's "Introduction" appeared in 1898 practically in the form in which it had been published in the previous year when the entire work was re-set. For the new edition which thus appears after an interval of twelve years re-setting was deemed unnecessary, the alterations and additions being introduced on the stereotyped plates. Most of these changes affect the bibliographical notices which have been brought up to date, while references to older books which have been superseded by fresher publications have been excised. So far as the matter of the work is concerned, the most important modifications and additions are found in the criticism of Isaiah and Jeremiah where the more recent analytical work of Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti is duly recorded, without, however, receiving the author's support; then the

linguistic matter proceeding from the Assuan and Elephantine finds is estimated in its bearing on the date of Daniel and Ezra-Nehe-miah, the net result being that while there are many points of contact between Egyptian Aramaic and the Aramaic of the Scriptures the former is more archaic. It, therefore, becomes impossible, on the ground of language, to vindicate for the literary productions in question a higher date than the one warranted by internal evidence. Thus it will be seen that the newest "Driver" has remained much the same; for practically the bulk of the work has been left unaltered. The vagaries of the "advanced school" are rejected; there is a chariness in subscribing to the views of those who find in the prophetic books but meager kernels belonging to the pre-exilic seers, all else being post-exilic frame-work; nor is meter accepted as an all-sufficient guide to distinguish the genuine from the spurious after the fashion of Duhm and his followers. In the historical works, but notably in the Hexateuch, Prof. Driver has changed his position of twelve years ago in practically no point at all. Yet, where the bibliography at least has been made inclusive of most recent works, it is to be regretted that not only are some notable contributions overlooked, but especially that the author has not deemed fit to modify his opinions somewhat or at least to indicate his reasons for adhering to views so recently challenged. But this may be said in passing on to the other work where just those deficiencies are made good that Driver's work is concerned mainly with problems of literary criticism, whereas the historical criticism does not fall within its scope. It is true that Driver is not blind to the fact that a literary document may be late and yet incorporate a knowledge of institutions much older than itself; but that is not quite what we mean now by investigations into the history of literature as contrasted with mere literary criticism. For it is the merit of Gunkel and his school to have emphasized the point that even the oldest source that has entered into the make-up of a document has a long history behind it and that there is a long road from the earliest record of a legend to the period in which that legend was first composed, orally perchance. "Literarkritik" on the whole deals with literary compositions of larger dimensions, the first Jahvist, or the first Elohist, for example; "Literaturgeschichte" is concerned in that just as

well, but in much more: it would trace even those works to their sources, and these sources will naturally be oral in the end, but they may have constituted by themselves literary documents long before they were embodied in the great documents out of which our historical works in the Scriptures have been constructed. And the same holds good of the legal documents: not merely the institutions of which even the latest speaks may be old—that is granted by Driver—but even a literary record of them must have existed long before the documents were composed that are now extant. Another impetus came from the same school of Gunkel (we need only think of his own "*Schöpfung und Chaos*" and Gressmann's notable work on the origins of Judæo-Israelitish eschatology) and consisted in the placing of the cultural history of Israel within the larger frame-work of the cultural history of Western Asia: the net result has been an understanding of the futility of determining the date of a thought or opinion merely on the basis of where we first meet with it in the extant literature of Israel. It is impossible to enter here into the manifold ramifications of this subject; suffice it to say that while it has been abused by many, in the hands of sober scholars it necessarily becomes a formidable weapon with which to combat the excrescences of the older school of criticism. While both the latest edition of Driver's book and the smaller and less pretentious work by Sellin were printed in the same year (1910), it is the latter that is really up-to-date not merely on the bibliographical side, but principally because of its adjustment to the newer principles. We feel on every page and in every paragraph an element of newness which is refreshing. The author takes us into the very fray of conflicting opinions, but he always knows how to impart his own view, candid, sober, just. In Pentateuchal criticism he is greatly under the influence of Klostermann; but Eerdmans has been equally consulted, though not yet Wiener. The Pentateuch is composite; its component elements are the four well known "documents"; yet, in their sources, these documents ascend in part at least to high antiquity. Thus there are imbedded in the Pentateuch literary records of the pre-Mosaic (Gen. 14; 9, 25-27; 4, 23 f.) and Mosaic (Exod. 15, 21; 17, 16; 20, 1-17 the Decalogue! Num. 6, 24-26; 10, 35 f.; 21, 14 f.; 21, 17 f.; 21, 27-29; Exod. 20, 23-23, 19 the

Book of the Covenant!) period; from the period of the Judges proceed Exod. 15, 1-18; Gen. 49 in substance; Deut. 33; Exod. 34, 10-27; Deut. 27, 15-26; Gen. 48, 22 and much else; from the era of David Gen. 49, 8-12; Num. 23 and 24; from the time of Solomon the redaction of the Jahvist (from Gen. 2 to I Kings 2) and the first edition of the Elohist (from Gen. 15 to Josh. 24); Deut. 32 is placed about 850 and the second edition of the Elohist (from Gen. 15 to II Kings 3) about 800; to the period of Hezekiah belongs the combination of the Jahvist with the Elohist and the kernel of Deuteronomy; in 622 occurred the finding (to be taken literally) of Deuteronomy which was soon amplified, thus receiving in particular the historical introduction 1, 1-4, 4, and then worked into the Elohist; in the Exile the great deuteronomic history (from Gen. 2 to II Kings 25) arose by combination with JE; about 500 the Priests' Code was composed in Babylon, the sources of which, notably the Law of Holiness (Levit. 17-26), but also other parts, ascend into the times of Manasseh; Ezra's Book of the Law of Moses comprised our Pentateuch. Such is a meager outline of Sellin's view concerning the genesis of the Torah. But a similar conservatism coupled with modernity may be observed in his treatment of other problems outside the Pentateuch and the historical books. The Messianic passages are left to the pre-exilic prophets, in agreement with Gressmann. Deutero-Isaiah intended his own work to be ascribed to the older prophet to whose prophecies the Babylonian seer appended his own. While Maccabæan Psalms are not ruled out of court, Davidic hymns are pointed out, and the bulk of the Psalter is derived from pre-exilic times. In two brief appendixes the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, including the latest find of the Odes of Solomon, are described. The small volume deals also with the constitution of the text and the canon. Though written with a view to serving the needs of "wider circles," it will prove an excellent guide even to more searching students. I have come across a few errors (so e. g. the Samaritan Pentateuch is included among the versions, and among the latter the Vulgate is missing).—Alford's book, on the other hand, is strictly popular; it endeavors to present the literary history deductively in the frame-work of a general history of the Jews, much after the fashion of Reuss. The author will hardly lay claim to origin-

ality; but he has used the critical literature to good advantage; a learner himself, he is naturally committed to the views of a school which, in the light of my previous remarks, must be accounted as out of date. While the masters are busy revising their opinions in the light of the latest and freshest research, the scholars will naturally lag behind.—What has been said of Alford, is to still a larger extent true of Sheldon's "Story of the Bible," a posthumous second edition.

History of Old Testament Criticism. By ARCHIBALD DUFF, D.D., LL.D. With illustrations. New York and London: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1910. pp. xiii + 201.

The New Bible-Country. By THOMAS FRANKLIN DAY. New York: THOMAS Y. CROWELL & Co. (1910). pp. 32.

What Cheyne set himself to do in 1893 in his "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," a book full of information but somewhat marred by a polemic against the more timid among English critics, is now attempted in a smaller compass and in more popular form by Prof. Duff. The author who inscribes his work to the memory of his teacher Lagarde is largely under the influence of Duhm. His treatment of the history of criticism follows in main the beaten track after the fashion of the corresponding chapters in Holzinger's "Introduction to the Pentateuch" or Reuss' presentation of the subject in the introduction to his French (and German) translation of the Hexateuch, at least for the part dealing with Hexateuchal criticism. He is unconventional and novel in describing the period during which the documents which enter into the composition of the Pentateuch arose as one of criticism; the point of view being that as the Elohist sought to place his work in the room of the Jahvist, he exercised his critical faculty, just as the amplifiers and editors of the Jahvist before him had freely criticised that literary document, and just as the Deuteronomist freely handled the work of both Jahvist and Elohist. Similar freedom obtained later on in handling the text of the Pentateuch, as is evidenced by a comparison of the received text with that underlying the versions. This, of course, is Geiger's point of view, though the Jewish critic of the nineteenth century

is nowhere mentioned. Prof. Duff fails to take cognizance of Gunkel and Eerdmans. Otherwise he is well informed. The little work will serve its purpose well enough; as such it deserves the place which has been assigned to it in the "History of the Sciences." The volume is illustrated with portraits of sixteen leaders in the criticism of the Old Testament; that of Lagarde adorns the frontispiece. I doubt whether Lagarde would have relished the company; the greater number of his illustrious contemporaries he knew himself at war with; his strength lay in the main in fields other than the "higher criticism." The "New Bible-Country" of which Prof. Day speaks in his booklet representing an address delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, San Rafael, California, is the new view of the Bible maintained by criticism. Those that are satisfied with the old pre-critical views are admonished to leave criticism well enough alone; those, on the other hand, who feel the difficulties of the old traditions need not fear the results of the newer view so far as their love for the Scriptures is concerned. The critics, it is true, hold that many of the books of the Old Testament are composite; that the biblical writers sometimes incorporated mythical and legendary materials; that here and there they idealized the past; that many of the books of the Old Testament have undergone revision at the hands of later editors; that the Hebrews were indifferent to the fame of authorship, thus late works coming to be ascribed to famed men of an earlier day. But then the Bible is not a cyclopædia of information, nor a text-book of science or history. It is rather a divine-human record of God's revelation in progressive steps with the prophetic element predominating therein. "Prophecy prepares the way for Christ, not by uttering verbal predictions of His coming (for the prophets nowhere predict the details of His earthly life), but by doing its own work in its own day so grandly that Jesus when He came found a godly remnant, trained in the school of prophecy, ready to receive Him." Prof. Day apparently limited himself to Old Testament criticism and its bearing upon the Christian beliefs. Had he included in his "New Bible-country" the territory of New Testament criticism, let us say of the type of Schmiedel's radical position to which Duff expressly adverts, it may be reasonably doubted whether the alarms felt by his audi-

ence and by the Christian community at large would be so easily allayed. It must be owned that even New Testament critics of the most advanced class know themselves at one with the substantial doctrines of Christianity; but would an orthodox Christian rest satisfied with that residuum?

Alttestamentliche Studien. Von B. D. EERDMANS. I. Die Komposition der Genesis. pp. viii + 95. II. Die Vorgeschichte Israels. pp. 58. III. Das Buch Exodus. pp. 147. Giessen: Verlag von ALFRED TOEPPELMANN, 1908-1910.

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B. Oberlin: BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, 1909. pp. xiv + 239.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B. Oberlin: BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, 1910. pp. v + 152.

Das Deuteronomium. Eine literarkritische Untersuchung. Von Dr. A. FILEMON PUUKKO. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICH'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. ix + 303.

As is well known, the starting-point of the Pentateuchal analysis was Astruc's discovery (in 1753) of the divine names in Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus as a clue to the documents or "mémoires," as he called them, which entered into the composition of the Pentateuch. The attack on this basic theory and the gigantic edifice that has since been reared upon it comes from two quarters which though they have much in common on the side of method are different in their preconceptions and results; both, however, illustrate that regress to "first principles" by which questions seemingly disposed of are reopened, constituting as it does criticism's safest corrective when in forgetfulness of its own origin it shows itself ready to relapse into dogmatism. Prof. Eerdmans was a pupil of Kuenen's and is now the occupant of the chair formerly held by the intrepid Leiden critic. Up till recently he found himself in accord with the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school. Now, however, he has at length

emancipated himself, and in the three parts of his "*Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*" so far issued, after demolishing the current "documentary hypothesis" which according to his judgment is based principally on the erroneous theory of Astruc, proceeds to develop his own views. According to Eerdmans, Astruc's discovery has operated in throwing the critics off the scent. The divine names are far from being the mark of disparate compilation. The trouble is that the Old Testament students have quite as much as the scribes of old read monotheism into the texts of antiquity. Elohim means "the gods" in the plural, no more and no less. Where the term occurs, we are confronted by polytheistic notions. Naturally passages in which the polytheistic ideas are discernible even under their present cloak which is none too heavy must of necessity be archaic. They cannot possibly have been composed in post-exilic times. One need only think of the first chapter of Genesis (comp. verse 26). Moreover, the followers of Astruc are constrained to pin their faith to the received Hebrew text; but in no less than 49 places in the book of Genesis does the Septuagint differ from the masoretic text in the reading of the divine names. This is an appeal to the "lower," or textual, criticism. Similarly uncertain is the current argument from vocabulary or phraseology. The remains of the Old Hebrew literature are too scanty to serve as a safe basis for such fine linguistic discriminations. Recent archæological finds are calculated rather to prove the high antiquity of texts usually placed in latest times. Thus "the field of Abram" (comp. Gen. 23) occurs as a place-name in an Egyptian list of the tenth century (Breasted, Spiegelberg). A most frequent handle for detecting different "hands" is the lack of coherence in contiguous parts. Criticism thus reveals itself as an offshoot of interpretation. But the scalpel of criticism may be used too freely, too readily; and a difficulty of interpretation may be removed by ordinary exegetical processes. Thus in 16, 1-3 much depends upon the correct interpretation of **לְהַקֵּן עַמָּשׁ** at the end of verse 2—hence a purely lexical question. When the phrase is correctly interpreted, verse 3 ceases to be a mere repetition. Incidentally Eerdmans shows how a provision in the Code of Hammurabi throws much light on the episode in question. Ehrlich (*Randglossen I, ad locum*) equally finds the chronological notice

in verse 3 far from superfluous. Criticism operates too freely with supposed doublets. What may appear redundant at the first blush will in the light of fuller information prove a necessary part of the context which cannot be removed therefrom without destroying the sense. Elsewhere a supposed redundancy ("Überfüllung") may be due to scribal carelessness (dittography). Suffice it to say that all along the line the "higher" criticism must go hand in hand with the "lower" and the other subsidiary operations of philological interpretation. To this extent Eerdmans' anticritique comes as a timely warning against the too facile methods of removing exegetical difficulties by cutting the Gordian knot. It is frequently the easiest way out of the difficulty. But Eerdmans follows up his negative destruction of the current analysis by one of his own. The groundwork of Genesis consists in a "Book of Adam" or "Jacob recension" of a polytheistic character which was compiled out of still older sources before 700 (5, 1-32; 6, 9-22; 7, 6-9. 17-22. 24; 8, 1-19; 9, 8-29; 11, 10-26. 27-32; 12; 13, 1-13. 18; 15, 7-12. 17-21; 23; 25, 7-11. 19-34; 27; 28, 11-22; 32, 4-23; 33, 1-17; 35, 1-8. 16-20. 23-29; 36, 1-14; 37, 2. 25-27. 28b. 34. 35; 40; 41; 42; 45, 1-27; 46, 2b-7; 47, 6-12. 28; 49, 1a. 29-33; 50, 12. 13). As may be readily seen, much of what is currently reckoned to post-exilic P is assigned by Eerdmans to this ancient pre-exilic source. The fact that a chronological system runs through it is no argument to the contrary. "We have grown into the habit of looking upon anything of a systematic character as necessarily late... We should grievously err in conceiving the pre-exilic times as a period devoid of the higher civilization. The legislation contained in the Book of the Covenant sets us right on that score. The chancellor at the court and the frequently mentioned "scribes" (soferim) suffice to prove the existence of a class of learned men. To this class we naturally owe the transmission of the ancient traditions. There is no reason why these pre-exilic soferim should have not possessed historical knowledge quite as much as the post-exilic soferim." Polytheistic notions, according to Eerdmans, underlie many of the elements that entered into that source. The compiler apparently was of the opinion that the God of Israel was but one among many. Into the groundwork was subsequently, but still in pre-deuteronomic

times, worked another recension, the Israel recension, which ran parallel to the older source in contents and in spirit. Herein Eerdmans reverts to the "supplement theory": the supplementer took over from the parallel source just enough to round off the historical picture. The work thus amplified then underwent in post-deuteronomic times a revision from a monotheistic point of view. The process of revision went on for a considerable time thereafter; hence the post-exilic additions, some larger (like chapter 17), some smaller (glosses). Gen. 1-2, 3 may and may not be older than chapter 17; on the other hand, Gen. 14 (with minor exceptions) is of pre-exilic origin. The bulk of the legends in the book of Genesis originated among the masses; the common people accepted the monotheism of Deuteronomy with a strong admixture of polytheistic notions. Even post-exilic Jewry believed in a multitude of spirits by the side of the One God. "Should we not reasonably expect traces of a polydæmonistic religion in the pre-exilic tradition?" The reader will now perceive that, with Eerdmans as a guide, the current critical analysis with three well-defined documents makes way for a series of revisions of an ancient groundwork, and that in the measure as the greater part of the book of Genesis, including notably such passages as have hitherto been pronounced to be of exilic or post-exilic origin, gains in the point of antiquity, it loses on its religious side, being reduced to the low level of pre-deuteronomic polytheism. Jewish monotheism dates from the time of Josiah and Jeremiah; among the masses it is of still later date. But the literary composition of the bulk of the book of Genesis ascends into the eighth century or even farther up. The fine polish of literary style obtained already then, albeit even with the cultured classes the Lord was but one among many!

If we have lost in Genesis an ancient record of monotheism, if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob cease to be proclaimers of the One God, are they at least historical personages? and are the accounts of the beginnings of the people of Israel contained in the book of Genesis to be given credence? For in the school of the literary critics there has hitherto prevailed an attitude of skepticism on those very points. The exegetical method applied by the critics of the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school has been clearly the alle-

gorical one; not to be sure of the Philonian kind, but allegorical nevertheless. The patriarchs have been pronounced to represent humanized deities (B. Luther, Ed. Meyer); or the patriarchal legends are said to have been originally myths which were then translated into their present form (Stucken, Winckler, Erbt, Völter, Jensen), or to be reflexes of Israelitish life and customs during the period of the monarchy (Wellhausen, Stade, and others). To these opinions as currently held by the one or the other Eerdmans opposes his own view which comes pretty near substantiating the historical character of the patriarchs. Not that every detail of the patriarchal story can be verified: the legends of Genesis, being folk-products, must be traced back to a variety of motives and origins. But the historicity of Abraham is established beyond doubt from the mention of "the field of Abram" in an Egyptian list of the tenth century (see above). And what is of equal importance the main fact that the ancestors of Israel dwelt in Canaan previous to the people's migration to Egypt equally receives confirmation at the hands of Egyptian monuments. We know from the stele of Menepkah (discovered in 1896) that about 1230 B. C. Israel dwelt in Palestine. Moreover, while the other places and lands mentioned there receive the determinative indicative of a country, there is prefixed to Israel a man and a woman with plural strokes; that is to say, Israel does not denote a territory, but a tribe. It appears also to be spoken of as an agricultural population. Eerdmans sees in all this a reference to the conditions exactly as they are depicted in Genesis: a small body of semi-nomadic folk held together by tribal ties but without a country of their own, though they own land. These conclusions make it necessary for Eerdmans to place the exodus at a somewhat later period than is currently assumed, about 1130 B. C. He identifies the 'Apriw of whom mention is made in the monuments of the intervening century with the Hebrews, and rejects the theory which looks for the Hebrews in the Habiri of the Amarna tablets. The patriarchs were not nomads (Wellhausen), but semi-nomads (Ed. Meyer): they owned cattle but also land. There is no truth in the current distinction between a nomadic and an agricultural period in the life of Israel nor in the customary deduction that the prophetic religion is the resultant of a

clash between the Dionysiac civilization of the monarchy and the simple Bedouin traditions of antiquity. If the patriarchs tilled the soil, then the Israelites were from the start an agricultural people.

The effect of these deductions on the dating of the legal portions of the book of Exodus is obvious. On the assumption of the purely nomadic civilization of Early Israel, no place could be found for such a code of laws as the Book of the Covenant before the times of the monarchy. It is characteristic that in a footnote to the 1905 edition of his "Prolegomena" (p. 392) Wellhausen gives expression to his conviction that the "peasant code" of Exod. 21 and 22 is in its basis Canaanitic, i. e. pre-Israelitish. He pointedly adds: "The Laws of Hammurabi are better edited, but are just as little manufactured as those of Exod. 21 f.; they may equally be very ancient. It does not, however, follow from the fact that they are ascribed to Hammurabi that they were really promulgated by him. In view of our experiences elsewhere this conclusion of the Assyriologists is not quite cogent. It may be said a priori that the reverse is more probable." Eerdmans goes further; he sees no reason why the Book of the Covenant could not come from Mosaic times. Nor is he averse to placing the Decalogue in the same period; but it is a Decalogue much abbreviated and much shorn of the hallowed associations which both Jews and Christians connect with it. To be ancient, the Decalogue must not be positively monotheistic. The First Commandment is rendered not "I am the Lord thy God," but "I, Jahveh, am thy God." The Second Commandment merely proscribes the adoration of the images of other gods in the sanctuary of Jahveh; "before Me" is taken most literally. Incidentally the current conception of the prophets as originators of "ethical monotheism" is controverted. An ethical conception of the Deity existed in much earlier times (even among non-Israelites). Otherwise the Book of the Covenant remains unexplainable. As for the rest of the book of Exodus, suffice it to mention that, according to Eerdmans, Exod. 12 is in the main pre-deuteronomic; a pre-exilic kernel is also assumed in the chapters dealing with the description of the tabernacle (25-29; 35-39) which are currently assigned as a whole to P.

A reader with conservative leanings will naturally turn away from Eerdmans' three volumes with much shrugging of the shoulder and feel safer with the two publications by Mr. Wiener, a barrister-at-law in London. Like Eerdmans, Wiener operates with the "lower," or textual, criticism versus the "higher," or literary, species. It speaks well for the seriousness with which he has approached his task that he has not shirked the labor of acquainting himself at first hand with the literature bearing upon the correctness of the received text. He has consulted Kennicott and De Rossi; Field's Hexapla and Lagarde's Lucian; the larger Cambridge Septuagint and the latest article on the grouping of the codices in Genesis by Dahse. He gives tabulated lists of variants for the divine names in Genesis. He endeavors to show that in following up Astruc's clue scholars have adhered too closely to the received text. He is ready to concede that the latter must occasionally be given up and that better readings are preserved in manuscripts not commonly accepted as trustworthy or in the versions. He believes that the same recourse to the Greek version and especially to certain recensions thereof which is had in the Books of Samuel for example should be had likewise in the Pentateuch. It may be safely presumed that Wiener's insistence on constructing a better Hebrew text will not be challenged by critics, nor for that matter his canons of textual criticism so far as they are general in character. But Wiener, I believe, underestimates a possibility with which criticism has to reckon: the ancient translators may have introduced conscious changes for the sake of removing difficulties of contradiction or incongruity. Harmonistic manipulation of the text in the original or in translation precedes the harmonistic exegesis of which examples abound in the talmudic-midrashic literature and in the mediæval Jewish commentaries. *Lectio ardua praestat.* A difficult reading is always to be preferred to an easy one. Like all canons of criticism, this one likewise must by no means be applied through thick and thin, but should be taken with a grain of salt. Wiener applies textual criticism also to other difficulties not proceeding from the diversity of the divine names with notable success. But the crucial problem is that of the divine names, and I am free to say that

neither a self-sufficient leaning on the received text nor an unreasonable measure of skepticism is in place. A monograph on the divine names in the Pentateuch would be timely. It will involve a grouping of the Greek codices which is no easy task.

Wiener meets the critics on their own ground. He applies the textual method where it will serve his purposes. He does not shirk delving in archaeological and anthropological lore. His reading is extensive. It includes for instance Norden's *Kunstprosa*. He cites a passage which the writer of this review has long recognized as having a bearing on the question of biblical style. The difficulties arising from the laws with regard to place of sacrifice or to the personnel of the temple he solves by theories which are certainly ingenious. He distinguishes between customary lay-sacrifices, national offerings, and statutory individual offerings. He pleads after the manner of Hoffmann that P does not square with the post-exilic practice. The net result of his anticritique is the concession that there is post-Mosaic material in the Pentateuch; but at the same time he establishes the presence of pre-Mosaic material. The text needs re-constructing; but the bulk fits the Mosaic period, and that only. He rehabilitates Ezekiel: the prophet reverted to the Mosaic tradition because it fitted the circumstances of his time. The presence of a sanctuary in Elephantine proves to him the antiquity of the Mosaic legislation: Moses framed a law for Palestine; when the exile came and the synagogue as a substitute for the temple worship had not yet been evolved, each section of Jewry was free to adjust the law to the changed conditions as best it might. It is interesting that Wiener's conclusions come pretty close to the decisions of the Pentateuch commission appointed by Pope Leo XIII (see *Osservatore Romano*, 1906, No. 164). The Pope likewise concedes post-Mosaic glosses and textual modifications, just as he also assumes pre-Mosaic material. The papal commission grants that Moses may have dictated the contents of the Torah and that thus the incongruities in language and style may have arisen. We lay aside Wiener's publications of which "The Origin of the Pentateuch" is the more popular and which are being followed up by a series of articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* with this feeling: The Pentateuchal question will bear reopening. The critical position

has become the orthodox one; but neither orthodoxy nor fashion is a measure of scientific achievement. Where the issues are so momentous, cool and unimpassioned judgment is exceeding difficult. But undignified expressions are as much out of place with the traditionalists as they are with the critics. The tone adopted by Wiener is not always a pleasing one. But few will read his studies without learning something from this intrepid champion of tradition who uses many untraditional weapons; not the least lesson being that criticism can ill afford to rest on foundations which cannot stand a fresh test with regard to their solidity. And the test has been instituted by Wiener and Eerdmans. On the negative side, they meet; on the positive, they are as far apart as Hoffmann and Wellhausen have ever been.

Puukko's volume moves along the tracks of the literary criticism current in the dominant school. He establishes the historicity of the account of the finding of the Law (II Kings 22) against the hypercritics (Havet, Vernes, Horst, Day, Cullen). No other of the extant codes will answer the description of the Josianic Torah than Deuteronomy. But Deuteronomy itself is composite. In unraveling the process of composition—what the author considers as the "Urdeuteronomium" he prints at the end in translation—he combats a variety of theories that have been propounded by others, not the least important being that of Klostermann who by means of a somewhat far-fetched analogy from Icelandic law finds the essential part of the Moabitic code in the hortatory framework by which it is enclosed no less than in the parenetic comments which accompany the laws themselves: the Deuteronomic code ascending in substance to Mosaic times was the type of all legal instruction which it was customary for the functionaries of law to give generation after generation in the form of elucidation and exhortation, in short, after the manner of an oration such as is the great oration of Moses which constitutes the bulk of Deuteronomy. Puukko adopts a theory evolved by two previous writers on the subject (Staerk and Steuernagel) to the effect that the "singularic" portions constitute the original of the Deuteronomic Code as promulgated in the eighteenth year of king Josiah.

Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Studien zur Sacharjaprophetie und zur jüdischen Geschichte im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert. Von Dr. J. W. ROTHSCHILD. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICH'SSCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. ii + 219.

Die Bücher Esra (A und B) und Nehemja, textkritisch und historisch-kritisch untersucht. Mit Erklärung der einschlägigen Prophetenstellen und einem Anhang über hebräische Eigennamen. Von G. JAHN. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1909. pp. xcii + 289.

Ezra Studies. By CHARLES C. TORREY. Chicago: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1910. pp. xv + 346.

Geschichtliche und literarkritische Fragen in Esra 1-6. Inaugural-Dissertation von Johannes Theis. Münster i. Westf., 1910. pp. vii + 60.

Next to the Pentateuchal question, and indeed playing into it, the critical and historical questions connected with the literary documents of the early post-exilic period have given rise in the last fifteen years to a number of special investigations; the appearance of four works devoted to the same circle of related problems or to some specific problem within that circle shows how far the subject keeps engrossing the attention of scholars and how much debated ground there still exists. In close sequence upon a previous publication on Haggai entitled "Juden und Samaritaner" (1908), Rothstein seeks to penetrate into the meaning of the seven nocturnal visions of the prophet Zechariah. After clearing the text of glosses and corruptions by a process of subjective conjecture, the author arrives at the conclusion that all the visions came to the prophet in one night, the night or rather the dawn of the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month in the second year of Darius. Convinced as the author rightly is that the immediate occasion of a prophetic utterance must be found in the occurrences of the day and that its primary object is the message it bears to the seer's contemporaries with their actual present-day needs and problems, he draws the lines backward and forward as he finds them in the literary productions at both ends with the result that they converge to form a picture of the events external and internal

to which an adjustment on the part of the new community was imperative. How far the picture when completed really squares with the facts may still be a matter of doubt. But then the facts are so scanty that a gauge is scarcely available, unless it be that of inner probability; and the impression produced by Rothstein's reasoning is that his conclusions are by no means improbable. The two months which followed upon the message of Haggai ending with the outlook into a purified community and with words of encouragement to Zerubbabel were sufficient to produce in the heart of the new community the selfsame pusillanimity and despair which had taken hold of them before Haggai arose. New intrigues on the part of the enemies of Judah manifested themselves; and altogether the community was perplexed by a variety of problems which required meeting. To them Zechariah addressed himself. He saw the vision of the dawn of a better day; he was assured of the Lord's great plans for the welfare of the community then and later. Statesmanlike he counseled the abandoning of the project to build the walls of Jerusalem. That was dangerous then; the time had not yet come for that, though it did come later. There was an element in the community that operated with the Messianic expectations such as had been aroused by Deutero-Isaiah and thought the moment opportune for carrying them to fruition. Not so the prophet. For the prophet, let it be remembered again, must see into the needs of his day; nothing was farther from the Jewish prophets than a fixed scheme of salvation applicable to all times. With reference to the farther and farthest outlook they were all of one mind; they differed, and had to differ naturally, when the questions uppermost for the moment had to be answered. Things may be expedient, that is realizable, and therefore politic, at one time and not at another. The salvation of the new community demanded that the extravagant political notions of the Messianists should be deferred. With the keen eye of the seer, Zechariah realized that only on the basis of Ezekiel's programme could the constitution of the new community be effectively constructed. And that programme was practical, because it was adjusted to the immediate conditions. Thus the Messianic king had to be placed in the background or at least subordinated to the highpriest. But the priesthood required

purification. "Joshua was clothed with filthy garments." The admixture with the populace had involved the priestly families. The purified sons of Zadok were to constitute the leaders of a purified community, much though the degraded Levites, the former priests at the highplaces, intrigued against them. Rothstein endeavors to show that not only in this central thought does Ezekiel's influence show itself in the visions of Zechariah, but likewise in some of the less important points. Zechariah thus becomes an important link in the development of ideas between Ezekiel and Ezra with his Priests' Code; when the new community was constituted, it became apparent to its spiritual leaders that the Deuteronomic Code required much modification in the spirit and along the lines of Ezekiel if it were to become operative. Once Ezekiel's programme had become actual in its most important points at least, the way was paved for the activities of Ezra and Nehemiah some seventy-five years later.

Unorthodox as all this may seem to some readers, it is eminently orthodox compared with the radicalism of Torrey and Jahn. It is interesting that the two Ezra critics are Arabists of high standing. Jahn has of late years turned his attention to Old Testament studies; his principles of textual construction have, I believe, not commended themselves to scholars no less brilliant, but perhaps a trifle more staid. Torrey's first effort in Ezranic criticism dates from the year 1894. The pamphlet entitled "The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah" was, as we are told by the author in the preface to his "Ezra Studies," a volume made up of papers that have appeared elsewhere (with exception of the last chapter which is entirely new), not sufficiently taken notice of by scholars; the reason for the neglect, he thinks, lay in the circumstance that so novel a position as his was was presented in too succinct a manner and that much that required fuller treatment had been disposed of by the way, in short, had been taken for granted. Jahn (who acknowledges his indebtedness to Torrey's earliest publication) and Torrey, though disagreeing on a number of points, so for instance on the original language of the Aramaic portions, are of one mind in their principal contentions. Jahn formulates his theses, no less than eighteen, in the large Introduction the bulk of which is devoted

to a spirited repudiation of the opinions of other scholars who though more or less at variance with each other stand on the opposite side in this important debate; while thus the argumentation in the Introduction is more of a negative character, the positive proofs for his startling theories are developed in the book proper which takes on the form of a running commentary on Ezra-Nehemiah. (Incidentally Jahn tries to prove that the forms of the proper names in the Septuagint reveal the presence of many heathen deities thus establishing the persistence of polytheism down to post-exilic times.) Torrey, on the other hand, proceeds in a more systematic manner; in a series of chapters he builds up his argument into which a variety of questions enter, textual, linguistic, literary, historical; it is moreover, presented with consummate philological skill and erudition; when thus the destructive work is done, he winds up with a chapter which he regards as constructive, wherein his positive opinions as to the origin of the books in question and the history of the times from 722 to the end of the second century B. C. are set forth with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired. In substance the novel theories of Torrey (with whom, as has been noted, Jahn is in the main at one) amount to no less than this: The so-called apocryphal I Esdras contains the genuine Septuagint translation of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, albeit in a fragmentary form. The underlying Semitic original (half-Hebrew, half-Aramaic) constituted one of the recensions of the Chronicler's work; it contained the interpolated Story of the Three Youths composed in Aramaic (according to Jahn, in Hebrew). The Chronicler incorporated in his work the "Words of Nehemiah" (the greater part of the first six chapters of Nehemiah) and an Aramaic Story of Samaritan Intrigues (Ezra 4, 8-6, 14). While the former was an ancient document which may be accepted as historically trustworthy, the latter was a late fabrication nearly contemporaneous with the Chronicler, its purpose being to present the history of the post-exilic Jewish community in such a manner as to show that its antecedents were to be found in the exiled Babylonian community rather than in the native population of Palestine that remained on the soil after 586. The point of the story was directed against the Samaritans who, it was represented,

were from the beginning rejected by the children of the Golah. The Chronicler had before him the Pentateuch, but the Priests' Code was compiled long after Nehemiah. The final redaction of the Pentateuch must have preceded the Samaritan schism; hence the date of the latter event is placed just a trifle ahead of the advent of Alexander the Great. Previous to that time Jews and Samaritans lived in tolerably amicable relations. The importance of the Babylonian exile has been exaggerated. "Pre-exilic" and "post-exilic" are misleading terms. Not the exile, but the Dispersion was the all-important event in the history of Israel. The dispersion began at an early period, and was to a great extent voluntary. The Babylonian exiles made themselves at home in their new environment; they became citizens of their adopted country and contributed to its building up in the capacity of traders and financiers. They neither longed for a return nor did they occupy their leisure-time with literary productions. The Book of Ezekiel is an apocryphon composed about B. C. in Palestine; Deutero-Isaiah at an earlier time wrote in Palestine; the Priests' Code was compiled in Palestine. Jewish legalism and narrowness dates from the beginning of the Hellenistic period; the early post-exilic community was far more tolerant and universalistic-prophetic. There was no return under Cyrus; the edict is a fabrication. Ezra is a fictitious personality. Long before Nehemiah, Jerusalem had been rebuilt by the remnants of the native population, those that had not emigrated. The temple was rebuilt under Darius I in the times of Haggai and Zechariah (according to Jahn, in the days of Nehemiah). Nehemiah found the city in a weak position; he rebuilt the walls. All these extremely novel and startling theories are presented with a degree of certainty which fairly takes one's breath away. I doubt nevertheless whether Torrey will have more success with his latest publication than was accorded him in 1894. The sweeping distrust of tradition condemns itself. There is too much falsification to be assumed lightly. It must, however, be granted that Torrey deserves to be heard before he is brushed aside. His work contains a number of points which must be well weighed. His investigations betray a solid amount of painstaking study. I call particular attention to his discussion of the Theodosian origin of the so-called

II Esdras. His grouping of the Greek codices seems to be borne out by the facts. His sallies against the indiscriminate, dilletantic use of the Septuagint will merit approval. He is conscious of the difficulties that beset the path of retroversion from the Greek, far more conscious than Jahn. The latter is much too facile with his construction of Hebrew sentences. Contrast the retranslation of a portion of I Esdras as done by both men. Torrey has studied the style of the Chronicler to great advantage. What he has to say on the biblical Aramaic as compared with Egyptian will on the whole approve itself, though, I fear, he does not take sufficiently into account the orthographic peculiarities of the later scribes. The Assuan and Elephantine papyri are originals; the biblical texts have been copied again and again. It is quite conceivable that if we had access to the autographs of the Aramaic portions of Ezra, their orthography would be much the same as that of the Egyptian documents. The pronunciation of the dentals in Aramaic must have fluctuated for some time, probably for centuries; both the earlier and the later orthography failed to square with the actual pronunciation; where the one erred on the side of archaism, the other was faulty on the side of modernism. Scholars that have no particular theories to defend may still maintain with good conscience that to all intents and purposes the Palestinian and Egyptian Aramaic come very close to one another.

It is interesting to add that in Theis' dissertation which contains but a part of a larger work to appear in the series "*Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*" edited by Prof. Nikel (himself the author of a publication dealing with the vexed problems centering in Ezra-Nehemiah) Torrey's theories concerning the character of I and II Esdras which in the main are also those of Sir Henry Howorth are accepted in full. It will be instructive to see how far they will be turned by the Catholic author to conservative uses.

Aegypten und die Bibel. Die Urgeschichte Israels im Licht der aegyptischen Mythologie. Von Dr. DANIEL VOELTER. Neubearbeitete Auflage. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1909. pp. viii + 135.

Israel und Aegypten. Die politischen Beziehungen der Könige von Israel und Juda zu den Pharaonen. Nach den Quellen unter-

sucht von Lic. theol. ALBRECHT ALT. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICH'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1909. pp. 104.

Die Bedeutung des Namens Israel. Eine quellen-kritische Untersuchung. Von Lic. theol. EDUARD SACHSSE. Bonn: CARL GEORGI, 1910. pp. iv + 79.

Völter's work, first published in 1898 and now appearing in its fourth edition, is built up on the theory that the heroes of Israel, the patriarchs and Moses, are humanized deities; in contrast with the Pan-Babylonists, he looks for the originals in Egyptian mythology. See above the reference to Eerdmans' criticism. It is assumed by Völter that when Israel entered Palestine, it found a civilization largely permeated with Egyptian influences which increased through the subsequent centuries during which Israel remained in close contact with Egypt. To the political relations between the two nations Alt devotes a well-written monograph. He begins with Sheshonk (Shishak) and winds up with Necoh. The study is preceded by an enumeration of the sources. The story as developed by the author reveals the sad plight of the two kingdoms between the treacherous Egyptian power which was the instigator of all the foolhardy attempts at shaking off the Eastern yoke through trust in the "broken reed" of Egypt and the overowering strength and political statecraft of the powers in the East. In consolation the writer demonstrates how that very conflict served to bring out the prophetic certainty which runs through the writings of the great seers from Hosea to Jeremiah and Ezekiel that "the kingdom of God on earth should not be built on the tottering foundations of politics, but solely on the unshakable ground of faith." Sachsse's study of the meaning of the name "Israel" is published only in part. Its main conclusion is that Israel as the name of the patriarch is more recent than as the designation of the collective body of the people or of the state.

The Early Religion of Israel. By LEWIS BAYLES PATON, Ph.D., D.D. Boston and New York: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, 1910. pp. 115.

Israel's Ideal, or Studies in Old Testament Theology. By Rev.
JOHN ADAMS, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARKE, 1909. pp. xi
+ 232.

The early religion of Israel means to Paton the pre-prophetic stage. The prophets, in particular those of the eighth century and their followers, were the reformers of the religion of Israel. Israel's religion had its origin in Semitic polydæmonism based on animistic conceptions. Jahveh was unknown to the patriarchs. He was originally a non-Israelitish deity with volcanic associations. Moses adopted him. When Israel entered Canaan, it found an indigenous religion which was polytheistic. Just as the historical people of Israel represents a "hybrid mass" into which the Canaanitic elements were absorbed, so did Jahveh gradually absorb the nature gods and departmental deities of the Canaanites whose various functions he assumed. Many of the heathenish conceptions of the Canaanites clung to Jahveh. He demanded right conduct, but "the rules of conduct applied only to relations with fellow-Israelites." "Of such virtues as modesty, temperance, and other forms of self-restraint the early Israelite had little conception." Nevertheless, even in its pre-prophetic stage the religion of Israel "was a worthy foundation for the more spiritual and ethical message of the prophets, just as their message was a foundation for the gospel of Jesus." The Old Testament religion rooted in the primitive religion of the Semites, but at the same time leading on to and coming to its full fruition in the religion of the New Testament—such is also the leading conception in Mr. Adams' "Studies in Old Testament Theology." But there is this to be said: the author's conception of growth prevents him from "reading too little into the Hebrew Scriptures." "The entire oak is already rolled up in the acorn; and everything that is yet to grow and effloresce in the gospel age is already planted or sown in the faith of Israel." Semitic monolatry leads to prophetic monotheism, and that to the New Testament Fatherhood. The writer devotes the greater part of his book to a sympathetic presentation of the doctrines contained in the Old Testament on the subjects of the spirit, sacrifice, the covenant, prophecy, the Messianic functions (the prophetical and priestly, the function of suffering), the divine wisdom, sin, salvation. The highest expres-

sion of Israel's ideal the author finds in Micah 6, 8. All through the volume which is written in a pleasing style there runs a sympathetic attitude toward that which from a Christian point of view is naturally only a preparatory stage for the consummation in the Gospels. The writer gives expression to a truth so easily overlooked by many that great religious leaders are far ahead of their times; and if the principle of growth is accepted, the germ of the future must indeed be traced to the hoary past. Nor is he blind to the fact that even in the religion which has the Gospel as its basis the masses have ever been prone to fall back into mechanical ceremonial. And so in Old Testament times, likewise, the spiritual religion of Moses and the prophets had at every turn to contend with the grosser conceptions of the masses. Nevertheless it was given to Israel to work out the ideal of righteousness, loving-kindness, and spiritual humble-mindedness. It is certainly refreshing to see the religion of the Hebrew Scriptures taken at its highest, the tendency of pure historical criticism with its analytic dissection and its regress to beginnings operating for the most part in the opposite direction.

Isaias. Diligenter revisus iuxta massorah (*sic*) atque editiones principes cum variis lectionibus e mss. atque antiquis versionibus collectis a C. D. GINSBURG, LL.D. Londinii: sumptibus SOCIETATIS BIBLIOPHILORUM BRITANNICAE ET EXTERNAE, MCMIX. pp. 93.

Specimina Codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum. Collegerunt PIUS FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI et JOHANNES LIETZMANN. Bonnae: A. MARCUS ET E. WEBER (Oxoniae: apud PARKER ET FILIUM), MCMX. pp. xvi + tabb. 50.

Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.. Heft I: *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch.* Von ERNST HAUTSCH. Berlin: WEIDMANNSCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. 28.

Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta. Die Propheten. Von Dr. O. PROCKSCH. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICH'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. 136.

The Octateuch in Ethiopic according to the text of the Paris codex, with the variants of five other manuscripts. Edited by Dr. J. OSCAR BOYD. Part I. Genesis. Leyden: E. J. BRILL (Princeton: The UNIVERSITY LIBRARY), 1909. pp. xxii + 158.

In a prospectus issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society under whose auspices the new edition of the Hebrew Scriptures by Dr. C. D. Ginsburg is to appear the undertaking is rightly compared to that of Holmes-Parsons' work on the Septuagint. To the writer of this review the point of comparison lies in the bewildering mass of sigla accompanying the variants. In other words, to judge from the specimen volume containing Isaiah, no attempt is being made in the grouping of the witnesses. If the Masoretic Text is primarily the text "found in manuscripts and early prints substantiated by that system of annotations which we call *Masorah*" (see this volume, 19), then the first duty of its editor must clearly be to lay before the reader an unambiguous statement as to which sources may properly be regarded as representing the *Masorah*. What a future edition of the Masoretic Text should look like the writer has pointed out on a previous occasion (*ibid.*, 21). Much preliminary labor will have to be done before that day will dawn. Meanwhile, it will be safe to follow Norzi in refraining from registering the material which the versions may yield in the distant future, but which at present is hardly so constituted as to find a place in the *apparatus criticus* of the Masoretic Text. The references to the versions, ornamental though they may be, will not be taken seriously, and should therefore be omitted entirely in the future instalments of Ginsburg's new Bible. I would further recommend that in the matter of variants of a direct character those bearing on the *ketib* and involving the consonants should be separated from those bearing on vocalization and accentuation. Nor is there any place in an edition like the present for conjectural emendation.—While the grouping of Hebrew manuscripts must be left to the distant future, two notable attempts at classifying the codices of the Greek Bible deserve mention. In a small pamphlet Hautsch presents the results of an examination of the text of the Antiochene fathers (Diodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Chrysos-

tom) for the Octateuch on the basis of quotations. It will be remembered that Lagarde long ago pointed out that the Bible of the Antiochene fathers will have been identical with Lucian's recension. Legarde, it seems, paid attention solely to the quotations from the historical books (Samuel, Kings). He came to the conclusion that the text of those citations tallied with the group consisting of 19. 82. 93. 108 and underlying his edition of Lucian. Hautsch, on the other hand, finds that at least for the Octateuch the Antiochene quotations do not square with that group at all, but with an entirely different group into which 54. 75 enter as elements and which has hitherto been identified with the Hesychian recension. It must be owned that an example like Josh. 10, 13 is an exceedingly telling one. If Hautsch's theory is to be accepted, then 19. 108 will have to be counted out from the group of manuscripts exhibiting Lucian's recension in the Octateuch; as a matter of fact, it has come to the notice of the writer that in the book of Joshua at least 19. 108 go frequently with Hexaplar codices like G or F; sometimes a reading of the Syrohexaplar can be found only in those two Greek cursives. As for 118 which Lagarde included among Lucianic codices, the writer has observed that in the book of Joshua it goes frequently with 54. 75. It is interesting to note that the series undertaken by the Göttingen academy known as its "Septuaginta-Unternehmen" of which Hautsch's publication forms the beginning owes its existence to Lagarde's initiative and, I believe, is maintained by the same scholar's legacy. Verily, science is no respecter of persons!—The story of the Greek text of the Prophets is, according to Procksch, an exceedingly complicated one. Of the extant manuscripts there is none that does not show traces of revision. By the aid of the marginal notes of the Marchalianus (Q) a large group of cursives (Group I) reveals itself as directly Hexaplaric, that is to say as a more or less faithful transcript of the Septuagint column in Origen's Hexapla. Hexaplaric readings have found their way also into the uncials, viz. the Vaticanus (B), the Sinaiticus (N), and the Venetus (= 23); the latter is also infected with readings from the Lucianic recension which in the main underlies a group of cursives designated as III. The Lucianic recension was in itself a very complicated affair. Lucian made use of the Hexapla and

more directly of the Hebrew text itself; moreover, he revised the Greek of the Septuagint so as to bring it up to the level of Atticistic Greek. Between the two groups I and III, an intermediate group of cursives designated as II may lay claim to represent the pre-Hexaplaric text, though in its present form it has undergone revision on the basis of the Hexapla (particularly in Ezekiel, to a less extent in Jeremiah; the Twelve and Isaiah are on the whole freest from Hexaplaric admixture), but also of Lucian. On the whole, the Alexandrinus of the prophetic books is a purer text than the Vaticanus. The preference usually given to B rests on the pernicious "Vatican dogma." It is to be regretted that A was not made the basis of the English Septuagint. Over against this it behooves us, however, to remember that what is true of the Prophets may not be true of the other books. Even among the prophetic books, the story of the text differs. Silberstein has proved that in the II and III Kingdoms B by all means represents the purer text. Others have proved the same to be the case with other books of the Octateuch. Both at Göttingen and Cambridge scholars are busy unraveling the complex history of the Greek text; what may be done by the aid of the Oxford Septuagint has been demonstrated by Procksch.—We need a larger number of students to assist in the work of grouping. Such labor requires training, not the least part of which is the ability to decipher and collate. It is not given to everybody to study the manuscripts in the various libraries where they are at present treasured. The publication by Cavalieri and Lietzmann enables young scholars to learn Greek paleography at a distance. The specimens are without exception taken from Vatican manuscripts; moreover, they cover the entire range of Greek literature, the profane or classical included. Nevertheless, a sufficient number of biblical specimens is included. Thus table 1 contains a specimen from the Vaticanus (B), table 4 from the Marchalianus (Q). It is to be regretted that no biblical cursives are included. But the aim of the editors has been to give specimens of the older manuscripts, particularly of those whose date may be readily ascertained. The student is thus afforded the opportunity of learning to decipher cursive script in the first place, and in the second place to study the script of each century. A small list of the principal works

dealing with Greek palæography is appended to the Introduction; no library should be without them.—Of what value the Ethiopic version is for the student of the Septuagint is a matter of dispute. In all likelihood the case is not the same in the various parts of Scripture. That the Ethiopic manuscripts underwent revision in the course of time cannot be gainsaid; it is quite likely that the Hebrew text had a more or less direct influence on the later manuscripts. For his edition of the Ethiopic Octateuch Dillmann used four manuscripts in all. The new edition of the Ethiopic Octateuch which is being prepared by Dr. Boyd and of which the first part containing Genesis appeared last year rests so far as the text goes on the oldest manuscript, a Paris codex designated by the editor as Y, while in the notes variants are given from a manuscript in the possession of Haverford College (R) in addition to the readings from the codices made use of by Dillmann. The style of the publication is modeled after the larger Cambridge Septuagint; minor orthographic peculiarities and scribal errors of the main codex are registered immediately below the text. It is to be hoped that the publication of the remainder of the Octateuch will not be delayed too long.

The Authorized Version of the Bible and its Influence. By ALBERT S. COOK. New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1910. pp. iii + 80.

Randglossen zur herbräischen Bibel. Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sächliches. Von ARNOLD B. EHRLICH. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICH'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG. I. Genesis und Exodus. 1908. pp. iv + 424. II. Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium. 1909. pp. 355. III. Josua, Richter, I. und II. Samuelis. 1910. pp. 346.

Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. In Verbindung mit... übersetzt und herausgegeben von E. KAUTZSCH. Dritte, völlig neugearbeitete, mit Einleitungen und Erklärungen zu den einzelnen Büchern versehene Auflage. I & II. Tübingen: J. C. B. MOHR (PAUL SIEBECK), 1909-1910. pp. viii + 952; viii + 629.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. By JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Hon M. A. (Cantab.). New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1910. pp. lxvii + 551.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Chronicles. By EDWARD LEWIS CURTIS, Ph.D., D.D., and ALBERT ALONZO MADSEN, Ph.D. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1910. pp. xxii + 534.

The Analyzed Bible. By the Rev. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D. The Prophecy of Isaiah. 2 volumes. New York: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. pp. 225; 229.

The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers. In the language of the Revised Version of the English Bible, printed in their metrical form, with headings and brief annotations. Edited by FRANCIS H. WOODS, B.D., and FRANCIS E. POWELL, M.A. In four volumes. Vol. I.—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah (1-39), and Micah. Vol. II.—Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Jeremiah. Oxford: at the CLARENDON PRESS, 1909-1910. pp. xxxii + 192; x + 240.

The Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah. By JOHN EDGAR MCFAUDYEN, D.D. New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1910. pp. xiv + 423.

The Authorized Version of the English Bible the tercentenary of the publication of which occurs this year is made the subject of a small booklet by Prof. Cook. The great influence which the older English version has exercised on English literature is traced with expert skill. The English Bible was long in the making; the version of 1611 was based on a long line of predecessors. But it excelled them all. It possesses a rhythm and a swing peculiarly its own. Of course, its language was not the language of the seventeenth century. No literary language squares with the idiom of the day. The biblical phraseology had been shaped by generations. Nor is the English of the Authorized Version obsolete to-day. There is a marked return to older standards in the best literary efforts of the hour. There is no modern writer but will betray acquaintance with biblical phraseology. In the last resort the

beauty of Bible language rests on the simplicity of the original. And in this regard the Old Testament obviously transcends the New. With the simplicity of construction and style goes the simplicity and universality of subject-matter.—Of recent learned commentaries on the Scriptures the two new volumes of the *International Critical Commentary* deserve in particular to be singled out. In his work on Genesis, Dr. Skinner has taken cognizance both of Eerdmans and Wiener whose strictures are met by a searching argument. In the work of Chronicles prepared by a colleague and a disciple of Torrey the influence of the latter's criticism naturally manifests itself, but none too obtrusively. Altogether the two volumes come up to the high standard of some of the best volumes of the series, notably that of Driver's work on Deuteronomy or Moore's on Judges. They are full of up-to-date information, and nothing is too trifling to merit comment.—Of Ehrlich's great German work the first three volumes have appeared. It represents a revision of his Hebrew work. No matter how one may object to certain mannerisms and especially the cynicism with which things hallowed by Jewish tradition and sentiment are handled, it is gratifying to observe that Ehrlich's great insight into the Hebrew language is coming to be recognized by scholars. It is a great lifework which none can afford but to take seriously.—The third edition of the Kautzsch Bible has made its appearance. The learned editor has laid his pen away for ever; he died while the work was in progress; the work of completion was left to his colleague Rothstein. The new edition differs from the previous ones in that the translation is accompanied by explanatory notes which as far as possible are free from the technicalities inherent in the larger commentaries; a short preface precedes each book. While the work is intended for wider circles, it is safe to say that it will continue to be used by theological students.—Of a distinctly popular character are the various attempts to make the Bible accessible to the English lay reader. Rev. Morgan's "Analyzed Bible" of which Isaiah has appeared aims by minute analysis to bring the biblical literature home to every inquiring mind. Its tone is conservative. The spiritual force of the biblical word is brought out with skill; historical orientation is provided

for. The Oxford Prophets for English readers are based on the Revised Version. In the notes which are brief and to the point much elucidation is given. The marginal notes of the Revised Version are retained; but a preference for some of the renderings there contained is indicated. The succinct headings will prove a great aid to understanding. Short introductions are prefixed to each book. As the chronological arrangement of the books shows, the point of view is a critical one; the short lines in which the prophetic utterances are printed serve to bring out the literary character of Hebrew prophecy. The Macmillan Bible for Home and School of which the first volume contains Isaiah by Dr. McFadyen differs from the Cambridge Bible and similar publications in that the text adopted is that of the Revised Version and that the notes, while full, deal much less with the strictly technical aspect of interpretation.

Selections from the Old Testament. Edited with introduction and notes by FRED NEWTON SCOTT. New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1910. pp. xxvi + 335.

The Old Testament Narrative. Separated out, set in connected order, and edited by ALFRED DWIGHT SHEFFIELD. Boston and New York: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, 1910. pp. xxi + 510.

The Narrative Bible. Edited by CLIFTON JOHNSON. New York: THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY, 1910. pp. 402.

Bible Stories to tell children. By WILLIAM D. MURRAY. New York: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. pp. 211.

To those who regret the wide-spread ignorance of the Bible on the part of the youth these works will prove welcome. Common to all is the retention of the Authorized Version in its main features. The Bible word is left as a rule to explain itself. Short notes and glossaries do the rest. Only in Murray's book intended for children is the biblical phraseology recast. Scott and Sheffield limit themselves to the Old Testament. Jewish readers will find Scott's little book exceedingly serviceable and freest from all bias; in Sheffield's work, suitable as it is in general, the point of view

is critical; with this fact in mind, the Jewish father may still unhesitatingly place it within the reach of his children. Both are well printed.

Dropsie College

MAX L. MARGOLIS